

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Craig A. George, #234347,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No.: 6:07-574-RBH
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
)	
Anthony J. Padula, Warden of Lee)	
Correctional Institution; M. Bell, Associate)	
Warden; Kay Hughes, Captain; NFN Davis,)	
Sergeant; NFN Bradley, Officer; and NFN)	
Johnson, Correctional Officer,,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required

to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Catoe's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

ORDERED that the plaintiff's [docket entry #22] motion for default is **DENIED**. **Further**, it is Ordered that the defendants' [docket entry #28] motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** as to plaintiff's claims that defendants violated his constitutional rights in failing to provide for his reasonable safety, placing him in administrative segregation, and transferring him to another prison. **Further**, as the plaintiff's remaining claim of deliberate indifference to his medical needs was not addressed in the motion for summary judgment, this case is hereby recommitted to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings on the deliberate indifference to medical needs issue.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
December 20, 2007